

So Ordered.

Dated: May 2nd, 2025



Frederick P. Corbit

Frederick P. Corbit
Bankruptcy Judge

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON**

In re:

1 MIN, LLC; HOTEL AT
SOUTHPORT, LLC; and TWELFTH
FLOOR, LLC,

Debtors.

LAN CAI, SHUJIE CHEN, TIANRAN
CHEN, WEIJUN CHEN, JIE CHU,
ZHAOJUN CONG, HE CUI,
JIANYING DING, JICHUN DU,
QING DU, JIEYING FENG, YUPENG
GAO, YIRAN HAN, JINYANG HU,
NAIXIN HU, XIAO HUANG,
JUNMEI JIN, XIN MENG,
WEIHONG LU, YUANYUAN MA,
MIN PAN, LEI PEI, HAO QI, XIAO
RONG, JUAN SHAO, HUI WANG,
JINGYI WANG, YUQUAN WANG,
ZIDONG WANG, RONGRONG WU,
ZHAOHUI XU, QI XU, JIE YAN, KE
YANG, QIN YANG, HONGYUN YU,
SHUXIAN ZENG, XIAOHONG
ZHANG, YING ZHAO, MINBO
ZHOU, NAN ZHOU, HUIQING ZHU,
ZILING ZENG, LUYI ZHANG,
JUNDI LIANG, TAO LI, YUN CAI,
HONGLIANG TANG, JIE TANG,
WENLUNG CHEN, SHI ZHANG,

Case No. 24-01519-FPC11
(Jointly Administered)

Adv. No. 25-80007-FPC

**ORDER VACATING DISMISSAL
ORDER AND DENYING MOTION
TO DISMISS**

ORDER RE: MOTION TO DISMISS – 1

JUN CHE, DAHE ZHANG, SHAN
WAN, XIAOHONG SUN, YAN LYU
A/K/A YAN LU, WENYAN WANG,
JIALIN TIAN, RUI TANG, XINHAN
LIN, SIYU LIU, JIANYING MENG,
PHUONG NGUYEN, YEQING PAN,
XUERONG QI, QIANG WANG,
JUNLI WEI, YUNFEI WU,
HONGYING YU, DONGLI ZHANG,

Plaintiffs,

v.

HOTEL AT SOUTHPORT, LLC,
TWELFTH FLOOR, LLC, 1 MIN,
LLC,

Defendants, and

WF CREL 2020 GRANTOR TRUST,

Intervenor-
Defendant.

THIS MATTER came before the Court on the Motion to Dismiss filed by 1 Min, LLC, Hotel at Southport, LLC, Twelfth Floor, LLC, and WF CREL 2020 Grantor Trust (collectively, the “Defendants”). (ECF No. 12) After hearings on the Motion to Dismiss held on March 25, 2025 and April 9, 2025, the Court entered the Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part AP Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss

the Complaint (“Dismissal Order”). (ECF No. 29) Shortly after, the Plaintiffs¹ filed a Motion to Reconsider the Dismissal Order. (ECF No. 33)

The Court held a supplemental hearing on May 2, 2025 to address the reconsideration motion. Pursuant to Bankruptcy Rule 7052, the Court’s oral rulings at the supplemental hearing constitute its findings of fact and conclusions of law, and the Court incorporates those findings and conclusions herein.

Having reconsidered the Motion to Dismiss:

IT IS ORDERED:

1. The Dismissal Order (ECF No. 29) is **VACATED**;
2. The Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 12) is **DENIED**; and
3. This interlocutory order is without prejudice to the Defendants renewing their arguments at trial.

///End of Order///

¹ “Plaintiffs” refers to the 70 named plaintiffs stated in the caption above.